

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 9th May 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at ten of the clock. Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

I.—PRIVILEGE MOTION *RE* ISSUE OF ORDERS UNDER SECTION 144, Cr. P. C. WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CERTAIN LEGISLATURE PARTIES.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House would remember that the hon. Member, Mr. Viswanatham has given notice of a motion on breach of privilege. I am going to explain the House the procedure that is to be followed regarding this; for, as there are many new members, I think it would be advisable on my part to explain the procedure to be followed in regard to these motions.

“ The question of breach of privilege should be raised ‘ at the earliest ’ opportunity and it is given precedence over the pre-arranged programme of public business. As far as the Speaker is concerned, he cannot decide the question of breach of privilege but he will have to say whether there is a *prima facie* case or not. As soon as the Speaker says that it is a *prima facie* case, either the Leader of the House or any other Member can move that the matter be referred to a Committee of Privileges. The House then debates on this Motion. In the debate, Members should not go into the merits of the case. On 30th June 1938, the Speaker of the House of Commons gave a ruling and it has become classical and is quoted in all the legislatures of the world. For the benefit of the Members of this House, I shall repeat it here. The Speaker said—

“ It would not be in order (while debating) to deal with the merits of the case or to criticise the action of the various persons concerned as this would be anticipating the work of the Committee which it was proposed to set up.”

If the House accepts the Motion, the matter is referred to the Committee of Privileges.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, you were pleased to read out to us the procedure to be followed by us in regard to motions on breach of privilege.”

(Sri P. Ramamurthi rose to speak and he and Mr. T. Viswanatham were both found standing.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Order, order, the hon. Member, Mr. Viswanatham is not yielding. So the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi will resume his seat.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I wanted to raise this question of breach of privilege. I intimated to you about it on the 7th instant, and so I think I have taken the earliest opportunity to do so.”

[9th May 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Yes, the hon. Member has done it. Nobody said that he has not done it."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am not saying that. I am only beginning from the very beginning of the question. I gave notice of my motion on the 7th instant. When I raised it in connection with the adjournment motion the Chief Minister was pleased to say that if at all it was necessary to raise it, it might be raised as a question of privilege. I said I would raise the matter in that form and you were good enough to say yesterday that it would be taken up to-day."

"Now, Sir, with your permission, first of all I shall try to establish that there is a *prima facie* case. Therefore I am placing the following facts before you for that purpose."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Will I have an opportunity Sir, to answer the question of the motion being in order or there being a *prima facie* case?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Yes."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, it has been held that if a Member is obstructed on his way to the Legislative Assembly, it amounts to a breach of privilege. If any outsider uses insulting language with reference to the conduct of Members in the House, it has been held to be a breach of privilege. If false statements are made or if incorrect statements are made against them, that also has been held to be a breach of privilege. On these points there is no difference of opinion. Now, Sir, I am only submitting to you that the promulgation of the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, on the 6th instant and the events that took place on that day satisfy the conditions laid down to bring forward a motion under breach of privilege. Now, Sir, I shall read the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, which was promulgated—

"Whereas it has been made to appear to me that the Members of Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Madras State belonging to the United Democratic and the Communist Parties, and their supporters and sympathisers and the Dravida Kazhagam workers and their sympathisers and the Communist Party Members and their sympathisers have decided to stage demonstrations on May 6, 1952 in front of the new Assembly Hall, Government Estate, Mount Road, by taking out processions, shouting slogans and carrying placards and flags and that acts of violence and mischief are likely to be committed and that such processions, demonstrations, shouting of slogans and carrying placards and flags are likely to lead to rioting and the disturbance of public tranquillity and the breach of peace,

And whereas I am of opinion that immediate prevention and speedy remedy are necessary, in the interests of public safety and for the preservation of public tranquillity, and local security,

And whereas there is no time to serve notices on parties and it is necessary to pass orders *ex parte*.

I, so and so, etc."

Now, Sir, here is an order in which the Members of this House have been attacked and insulted."

MR. SPEAKER:—"What are the words you refer to?"

9th May 1952]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I refer to the words ‘ whereas it has been made to appear to me that the Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Madras State belonging to the United Democratic and the Communist Parties’ There are other names also mentioned, but here we are concerned only with the reference made to the Members of this Assembly who belong to the United Democratic Party and the Communist Party. Now, what is the allegation made? The allegation made is that we have decided to stage demonstrations on 6th May 1952. We did not intend to do any such thing. Therefore it is a matter for enquiry. The officer has made a statement which according to me is an incorrect statement. And in view of the contents of that statement, it is also a malicious statement. Sir, that day was the first day on which the Legislative Assembly was beginning to function, or rather it was almost practically the first day this Assembly was beginning to function, and in order to create some kind of adverse atmosphere against certain Members belonging to the several parties mentioned in the order and to insinuate that they are not gentlemen, that language has been used. That language shows that a reflection has been cast upon us.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Please read the order again? ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The order runs as follows : ‘ Whereas it has been made to appear to me that the Members of Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Madras State belonging to the United Democratic and the Communist Parties, and their supporters and sympathisers and the Dravida Kazhagam workers and their sympathisers and the Communist Party Members and their sympathisers have decided to stage demonstrations on May 6, 1952 in front of the new Assembly Hall, Government Estate, Mount Road, by taking out processions, shouting slogans and carrying placards and flags and that acts of violence and mischief are likely to be committed’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ By whom? ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ By the persons referred to and by nobody else. If he means anybody else he has to apologise for his using wrong words; but if he means the Members of this Assembly it is an insult to us and those who are responsible for such a conduct should explain their conduct. But here, we are not expected to go into the details of the matter. So, suffice it to say that there is an allegation here that the parties have decided to do such and such a thing. Sir, a decision can take place only in a meeting, and even there, only when the point has been mooted. I, on behalf of the United Democratic Front, may inform the House that no such decision was arrived at by us; no such point was ever raised; such an idea did not even enter into our minds. Therefore, Sir, the statement contained in the order is a malicious statement, and I would say, it is a malicious allegation against a large number of Members of this House and it therefore comes within the question of privilege.

“ Not only that, Sir; it also goes further and says that on account of that decision, acts of violence and mischief are likely

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[9th May 1952]

to be committed. There is no greater insult to us than that an outsider should make such a reflection upon the character and conduct of the Members of this House."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has made the position clear."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" There are some other facts also to be mentioned. The Government have not stopped with merely making such a statement. In giving effect to that order they have posted policemen long before the time when the order is to be enforced. Though the order was to be enforced between 10 a.m. and 9 p.m. on the 6th instant, even from the early morning on that day, policemen were posted on all the roads, mentioned in the order, leading to the New Assembly Building and also within the compound of the building."

10-15 a.m. MR. SPEAKER :—" That has nothing to do with the privilege of the House."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am only leading you step by step. I request you to follow the wording of the order before you come to any conclusion. I am only saying that the order as it is worded has infringed the rights of the Members of this House."

" Policemen were posted to prevent the alleged demonstration, within the building which is our place of privilege. They were posted on the way to the Assembly, they were posted at the gates of the Assembly, they were posted around the Assembly and within the very precincts of the Assembly itself and they were posted behind the last rows of benches. There were eight or nine officers with pistols and with some kind of canes."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Was it done to prevent hon. Members from entering the House? "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Who will come here, Sir, if they are there? This posting of policemen within the Hall is a breach of privilege. There is no doubt about that."

" The other day the Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to say, when I was speaking on the adjournment motion, that he would have to make an enquiry."

MR. SPEAKER :—" When the House has decided the question and when the report of the Committee is placed before the House the hon. Member may then discuss those things."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I wish to make my point clear, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I may point out to the hon. Member that the living authority on Parliamentary Procedure is Sir Gilbert Campion, ex-Clerk of the House of Commons. In the famous Ramsay's case he was put certain questions by the Attorney-General, and he has answered those questions. I shall read for the benefit of the hon. Members, the questions and the answers—

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—

Q.—' I should not myself have drawn any inference contrary to your first inference from the mere fact that the Speaker allowed a debate,'

9th May 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

SIR GILBERT CAMPION—

A.—Of course, the Speaker ruled in a very definite way; he said, "The question before the House is one of privilege."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—'Yes.'

SIR GILBERT CAMPION.—'It almost looks as though in his mind he thought it was a question of privilege. I agree the Speaker cannot decide questions of privilege; he can only decide if there is a *prima facie* case for considering a particular matter as a question of privilege.'

I also agree. I cannot decide a question of privilege. The Speaker can only decide if there is a *prima facie* case for considering the particular matter as a question of privilege.

"Again the question was put by the Attorney-General:

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—'Does that mean more than saying that the subject to be discussed and which the House desires to discuss is, "Does privilege exist here or not? It is not my function to express a view about that"?'

SIR GILBERT CAMPION.—'That is true I think. The Speakers have not always been absolutely consistent about that. They have sometimes expressed themselves as though they were expressing a definite opinion on the question of privilege itself.'

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—'Yes.'

SIR GILBERT CAMPION.—Nowadays the Speaker guards himself by saying "The question raises a *prima facie* matter of privilege." He does no more than determine that point.'

"From the above it is clear that the question whether there has been a breach of privilege or not is to be decided by the House and not by the Speaker."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"There is no difference of opinion in regard to what you have read. I am in perfect agreement with you in what you have said. When once you decide that there is a *prima facie* case, it is the practice for the Leader of the House to rise and bring in a motion . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There are also instances where others have moved it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Therefore, Sir, it requires the Leader of the House or someone else to move a motion to refer it to a Committee; this is a matter of course; then it is debated and the House gives a verdict."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not so . . ."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am explaining to you the position as I understand it. The position is, after the Committee reports, the report is debated . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is wrong there. We are now discussing the procedure as to how a question of breach of privilege is to be raised. It should be understood by all Members. When the Speaker says there is a *prima facie* case, some Member, either the Leader of the House or some other hon. Member may move that the matter be referred to a Committee of Privileges. The House takes possession of that motion and debates it. As I have already said, 'it would not be in order while debating it to deal with the merits of the case or to criticize the

[Mr. Speaker]

[9th May 1952]

action of the various persons concerned as that would be anticipating the work of the Committee which it was proposed to set up. Then the motion is put to the vote of the House. If it is carried then the Committee goes into the matter, calls for evidence and other things and finally submits a report. Then the whole thing is debated by the House and the House can then award whatever punishment it deems fit. The House can do it."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" There is not much difference between what you are saying and what I am saying excepting on some small points. If you will kindly refer to page 135 of May's Parliamentary Practice you will find."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have referred to it already."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I refer to it every time there is a doubt and try to understand the practice. It is said there—

' Since 1909 it has been the usual practice in the Commons to refer the matter of the complaint to the Committee of Privileges and the House suspends its judgment until their report has been presented.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House must first decide and then the matter goes before a Committee."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" It is not the House deciding it. I will read it again"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If there is a difference of opinion after some discussion, we must agree to disagree. That is all."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I will read the procedure laid down, Sir—

' It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence of the notices of motions and orders of the day standing in the order paper of public business, and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed—a question which can only be decided by the House itself.'

" Sir, when you are pleased to say there is a *prima facie* case, the Leader of the House makes a motion to refer it to the Committee and it is on the report of the Committee the decision is made by the House."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have heard the hon. Member. I am going to follow the procedure I have already referred to."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Before you decide the question let me state the other acts."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Has the hon. Member given notice of them in the motion."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Yes, Sir. I came up to the stage of posting of the policemen in and around the Assembly and actually preventing the Members from entering the Assembly. Three or four hon. Members referred to this in their speeches yesterday. No clearer proof is required to tell you, Sir, that there is a

9th May 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

prima facie case of breach of privilege. The promulgation of the order making a false allegation against the members of this House, posting the policemen in the House and wrongfully restraining, molesting, and assaulting and taking one of them to the Sergeant—all these prevented hon. Members from entering the House in an unobstructed way. I only ask that you should rule that there is a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege after hearing, of course, the Leader of the House who is ready with some books. I have given you a list of acts which amount to breach of privilege and I only suggest that the Leader of the House should agree to refer the matter to a Privileges Committee as soon as it is constituted."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I wish to submit that the whole procedure is misconceived. As far as one can understand from the very long and discursive statements made on the subject up till now, the matter for complaint is that a certain order under the Criminal Procedure Code was passed by the Commissioner of Police and it amounts to a breach of privilege because it amounts to casting an aspersion upon the Members of this House. I am trying to clarify the position as put by the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham. Now the statement made as the basis for passing an order is that certain people have notified or the authorities received information from other sources that certain people are going to stage a demonstration on the roads and in front of the Assembly and round about it. Now it is the duty of the Commissioner of Police to prevent the staging of a demonstration because it would interfere with the orderly conduct of the business of the House, and the House, while it is perfectly independent in its deliberations stands as much in need of protection from disturbance as any individual or any other institution in the State. It is therefore not only right but it was the duty of the Commissioner of Police to pass such an order if he had been correctly informed and if the statements are correct. The question whether we can go behind the statement and enquire into the facts is simple. We cannot do it. I submit that we cannot convert an enquiry into the propriety of an order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code into a breach of privilege enquiry in this House and decide by the votes of partisans of the one side or the other and come to a decision in a matter which is strictly judicial. It would be wholly inappropriate. That is why it has been the established convention that such orders cannot become part of a breach of privilege question.

"Then, Sir, the hon. Member was urging and asserting that hon. Members were prevented from entering the House. Now, Sir, your statement of the procedure was simple and correct if I may say so, namely, that the *prima facie* question is to be decided by the Speaker, the question whether reference should be made to the Committee should be decided by the House without going into the details and the merits of the case, and when the report of the Committee is ready, the House discusses the whole case and comes to a decision. There is no need for any quotation being misrepresented in this matter. It is perfectly simple. The difficulty

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[9th May 1952]

arises when hon. Members in quoting chapter and verse go on adding their own comments along with the chapter and verse and confuse the issue. That is why the difficulty has arisen. But the matter is perfectly simple as you have put it.

"The issue of a prohibitory order of this kind by a Police officer or any other authority authorized to issue such an order under law, I submit, cannot become even *prima facie* a matter for discussion as a privilege motion in this House. Any order of that nature is *prima facie* outside the limits of the privilege question.

10-30
a.m.

"Then, Sir, the next question is the assertion that some policemen were posted here and they prevented members from entering the House. This I should like to say is only an assertion which is consequent upon a determination to get a certain point accepted by the House. We can make any number of assertions without any *prima facie* basis. Actually a demonstration was staged in this very building on the 6th. There were shouts and applause heard by hon. Members including the hon. Member who has made the motion. Then let us take the Speaker's election. Three hundred and seventy votes were cast. I can account for the five votes not cast. The two candidates did not vote. Three hon. Members were absent of their own accord and for private reasons. I submit there is absolutely no *prima facie* case whatsoever for the House or the Speaker to believe that there has been an infringement of the primary right of the Members of the House to enter the Assembly. Hon. Members may make any number of statements. But, in that way nothing can be done in the House unless we erect witness boxes and evaluate the evidence given by various Members. The question now before the House is the statement made by the hon. Member with regard to the *prima facie* case for moving this motion and for having this motion referred to the House for a preliminary decision. I submit, Sir, that the question of breach of privilege is entirely misconceived. It will be a bad precedent if every order passed for the sake of protecting the solemnity of the occasion and the orderly deliberation inside the House and to prevent disorderly and noisy scenes round about the House should become a matter of breach of privilege, and then I am afraid, there would be no end to it at all. Again, I wish to submit to you, Sir, that it has been the established practice both in the House of Commons in London and in our own House of the People in Delhi, to see that the precincts round about the House are kept silent and free from demonstrations and even now there is an order in Delhi about various roads round about the Parliament House. And for what the Commissioner of Police tried to do for the sake of Members, it is totally unjust to take up this matter as breach of privilege of the House. In fact, he helped us to conduct the business of the House and helped us to maintain the privileges of the House. If these things that had been prevented had not been prevented, there would have been a breach of privilege of every Member of the House and we would not have been able to conduct our deliberations properly."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I may tell the House that yesterday also some hon. Members complained to me that they were prevented

9th May 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

from entering the House. I think myself committed a mistake yesterday. One hon. Member was standing on my left side and I asked him to go away, as I thought he was a stranger."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, there are two points on which the Hon. the Chief Minister very cleverly based his arguments. The gravamen of my charge is that there is a reference that not merely some demonstrations will be made by somebody, but . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am sorry, Sir, the hon. Member has understood me to be clever in a wrong sense. I think a statement that hon. Members have organized a demonstration is no insult, no defamation and nothing whatsoever, even as a demonstration in the body of this hall was considered quite proper by themselves."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I am sorry to differ from the Hon. the Chief Minister who is one of the most respected leaders of our country. But, I think I have got a different sense of self-respect. When the Commissioner of Police passes an order to prevent Members from entering this House and when he makes a reference to the Members of the House, my self-respect and the self-respect of a vast majority of the Members in this House are certainly wounded. It is a reflection upon our conduct and character and there is no denying that. The second point is the posting of police officers within the Assembly Hall. It may be right; it may be wrong. The Hon. the Chief Minister may be under the impression that demonstrations and ugly scenes were prevented because of the posting of police officers. My complaint is against the statement that the presence of police officers was responsible for the maintenance of peace."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let me read the order—

Whereas it has been made to appear to me that the Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Madras State belonging to the United Democratic and the Communist Parties, and their supporters and sympathisers, and the Dravida Kazhagam workers and their sympathisers, and the Communist Party Members and their sympathisers have decided to stage demonstrations . . .

In my opinion, there is a *prima facie* case for this motion." (Applause.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I would now request the Hon. the Chief Minister to move the motion. Or, if he agrees, I will move the motion. Sir, I move—

' That the following question of privilege arising out of :—

- (i) the promulgation of an ex parte order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code on 6th May 1952 which contained false and insulting allegations against a large section of the Members of the Legislature belonging to the United Democratic Front and the Communist Party that they have decided to organise demonstrations, etc., and are even likely to do acts of mischief;

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[9th May 1952]

(ii) *the posting of policemen and police officers and special armed police in large numbers within the Hall, in the corridors behind the last rows of seats, and near about the lounge room and bath room allotted to the Members; and*

(iii) *the physical obstruction and annoyance caused to quite a good number of Members entering the Government Estate on their way to the Assembly Hall, which has affected the privileges of the Members of the House;'*

be referred to the Privileges Committee as soon as it is constituted."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, I second the motion moved by my hon. Friend Mr. T. Viswanatham."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That the following question of privilege arising out of :—

(i) the promulgation of an *ex parte* order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code on 6th May 1952 which contained false and insulting allegations against a large section of the Members of the Legislature belonging to the United Democratic Front and the Communist Party that they have decided to organise demonstrations, etc., and are even likely to do acts of mischief;

(ii) the posting of policemen and police officers and special armed police in large numbers within the Hall, in the corridors behind the last rows of seats, and near about the lounge room and bath room allotted to the Members; and

(iii) the physical obstruction and annoyance caused to quite a good number of Members entering the Government Estate on their way to the Assembly Hall, which has affected the privileges of the Members of the House;'

be referred to the Privileges Committee as soon as it is constituted."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, now that you have agreed that there is a *prima facie* case, I submit, with great deference, that it would be absolutely a wrong use of our privilege to refer it to the Committee of Privileges. The position requires to be explained. I do not want to go into the details. The privilege that is sought to be protected here is the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the dignity of the members individually and as a whole. The privilege of attendance obviously was not interfered with at all. The privilege of dignity of the Members is the question for evaluation and judgment now before the House. If certain groups of Members, wanted to organize demonstrations, processions and other activities, the first question is : ' Is it or is it not the duty of the Government and their officers to take steps to prevent any disturbances? ' *Prima facie*, I submit, it is the very duty of the Government and if they fail, every Member of the House whether he sits on this side or on the other side, would be entitled to complain about the conduct of the Government, that they did not take suitable steps to prevent

9th May 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

demonstrations and disturbances. If to-morrow the Members of the Government party were to organize demonstrations and make noise all round the House in order to prevent even a discussion on this motion, would it be proper and would not the Members on the other side complain that it is the duty of the Government to keep the streets and the precincts round about the House free from such disturbances? Unfortunately, this Assembly Hall is situated, not on its own grounds, but in the midst of very busy streets and it is necessary therefore to maintain peace all round this House and that is what has been done.

“Regarding the question of dignity, if it is said that Members have agreed or joined together for their own lawful political purposes to stage a demonstration, it is not an aspersion on character at all. It is the desire of all political parties that a demonstration should be effective, and effective in the sense that it should prevent the other side from thinking freely and from acting freely. That is the aim of all visible and audible demonstrations, and that unfortunately, in my opinion, has come to stay. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind, I submit to the hon. Members, that there was preparation for a demonstration.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“Not from us.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“If that is a statement of fact, I do hope the hon. Member will stick to it. Apart from this Motion, if he will never hereafter stage such demonstrations, I shall be very thankful to him.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“On a point of order, Sir. I do not want unnecessarily to interrupt the Hon. the Chief Minister. He was asking us whether hereafter we would not stage such demonstrations. I would like to know whether he is imputing it to us. In spite of our assertion that we did not do it, he is still imputing it to us. It is again a matter of breach of privilege, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I submit, Sir, that interruption from the other side deserves an interruption from me. The Members sitting on the opposite benches said that they did not do it. I said, ‘Well, I do not believe you, but I do hope that you will act according to your statement at least in future.’ It was my answer to Mr. Nagi Reddi.

“Regarding the question whether there is any *prima facie* case for the House referring it to a Committee of Privileges, I have given my humble opinion, with all respect, that it would be a gross interference with ordinary law, because it was necessary for the police to take action and it was necessary for the Members to have peace around them, especially on the first day of the session when, without much of precedents to guide us, the election of the Speaker which was hotly contested had to be gone through. It was absolutely necessary to prevent any ugly scenes consequent on these demonstrations, which were really apprehended. I have no doubt in my mind, and hon. Members not on the opposite side but on this side, have no doubt in their minds that demonstrations had been organized and that the judgment of the Commissioner of Police was

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[9th May 1952]

bona fide. The question is: 'Was it important enough to call for the issue of such an order?' I submit, Sir, that under the circumstances it was absolutely necessary and I take full responsibility, as being in charge of the Government, for having instructed that order to be issued for the purpose of protecting the House from disturbances. It would therefore be wrong and unfair to Government to put upon them the duties of preserving peace in the country and for conducting the deliberations inside the House, and at the same time stop them from taking action to prevent such demonstrations. Then the question is, if it was a *bona fide* judgment that demonstrations were intended, whether it was proper and right to prevent them; and we assume, I submit, Sir, that there is no doubt whatsoever that it was necessary to issue the order.

"Then the next point is, what evidence do we have before us. Whenever preventive action is taken, we lose a certain amount of evidence. Whenever any preventive action is taken, preventive action itself prevents the activities from being developed and therefore we lose a certain amount of evidence. Therefore, there was no disorder in the streets. As a matter of fact, a short-notice question has been given to me and I am going to answer it shortly, that certain people had to be arrested for having gathered where it had been ordered that there should be no gatherings, processions, etc. Sir, all these things will have to be taken into account to see whether it is a case for being referred to the Committee of Privileges. Where the facts were clear and where a breach of privilege, if the facts were correct, had occurred, then in order to test the evidence, we have to seek the assistance of the Committee of Privileges for the purpose of checking and shifting the matter. But here, I submit, it would be gratuitous to assume any basis for this charge.

"Then, Sir, I wish to say that the whole object of a demonstration in these days, whether it is from this party or that party, is—for what purpose?—to intimidate and overawe the Members of the House from expressing a certain opinion. It is the highest breach of privilege, therefore, for any one to organize such demonstration. Whether it was organized or not, we have the actual basic evidence in the matter. On that day there was sufficient evidence to show that the thing was in the air and it was designed to prevent the deliberations of the House. It was the day when His Excellency the Governor had to come and deliver the Address, and already on many occasions the police were aware and the Government were aware that, when His Excellency was moving about, he had to face demonstrations here and there, whatever may be the causes. It was the duty of the Commissioner to issue the order and that was all that the Commissioner did. When these reports were received by the police, they had to take precautions. What was the mischief done, assuming that the precautions were unnecessary? Peace was maintained and nothing happened. And the only mischief is their allegation that aspersion was cast on certain Members of the Honourable House. What did they do? According to the aspersion, as they say it was, they wanted to get a demonstration staged. Sir, now it is the order

9th May 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

of the day to stage demonstrations and there is nothing wrong in saying it. If I went to a court for defamation saying that it had been suggested by somebody that I and others would stage a demonstration in front of the Assembly Hall, I do not think I would get even a pie as damages. Therefore, there is absolutely no ground for referring this matter to the Committee of Privileges for enquiry.

"Again, Sir, with all due deference to you who is a master now of the question precedents in respect of these and other matters, I wish to submit that this question of privileges is changing from time to time. In old days, when a warrant was issued for the arrest of Members, it was a breach of privilege. Those laws have changed because the privileges of individual Members have to be correlated to the Civil and Criminal Law and to the requirements of order and peace. It is the privilege of the whole House that is considered to be more important now. The misbehaviour or misconduct of some Members of the House which would detract from the dignity of the House is a more important item of breach of privilege which ordinarily goes to the Committee of Privileges and not the behaviour of Government or their officers who have tried their best to protect this institution as it is their duty to protect this and other institutions of the Government. I do not wish to prolong my speech, Sir, and I hope the House will reject the motion."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I allow the hon. Member, Sri Ramamurthi, five minutes. As soon as he finishes his speech, I will put the Motion to the vote of the House."

10-45
a.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would very respectfully submit that the Hon. Chief Minister, while opposing the motion to refer this question to the Committee of Privileges, has gone out of the way by posing the question whether the order of the Commissioner of Police was justified under the circumstances or not. While I do not want to go into the question as to what motivated the Commissioner of Police in issuing the order . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member should first decide whether it is an aspersion on the Members."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The Hon. Chief Minister argued that it was the duty of the Commissioner of Police and it was his own duty as the Head of the Government to see to it that the business of this House was carried on in an orderly manner. It is on this specific ground that he has sought to justify this order and the subsequent conduct of the police and make out that there has been no question of breach of privilege as far as the order of the Commissioner of Police is concerned. I submit that on the basis of this very argument, there is a case made out for referring this question to the Committee of Privileges, for the simple reason that it is not left to the Hon. Chief Minister to take upon himself the responsibility of protecting the Members of this House and the Chair here. It is our responsibility and it is the responsibility of every member present here to see to it that the business of this House is conducted in an orderly manner; and if, for any reason,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[9th May 1952]

the House apprehends and if the Chair apprehends that it is not possible to carry on the business of this House in an orderly manner without resort to police help, it is for the Chair to seek the help of the police in maintaining order inside the House. It is absolutely wrong for the Hon. Chief Minister or for the Police Officer to interfere in the business of this House and cast aspersions on the members of this House that they are going to act in a particular way.

"Secondly, the Hon. Chief Minister pointed out that it was the duty of the police to see to it that disorderly scenes and demonstrations did not take place, that the Governor was protected against demonstrations and that demonstrations did not take place against certain members of this House. I submit, it is not a part of the functions of the police to stop demonstrations. Nobody can prevent demonstrations as it is a fundamental right guaranteed under the Constitution."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member may please speak about the point whether this order which says that certain Members have decided to stage demonstrations in front of the Assembly, amounts to a breach of privilege."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, the whole question is that it is not the business of the policemen to prevent any such demonstration, granting that there had been any such thing. Secondly, as far as the question itself is concerned, we must consider whether the members of this House or any section of this House have at any time thought of holding demonstrations either inside or outside the House. This question obviously cannot be decided on the basis of certain assertions made by the Hon. Chief Minister. Therefore, I say, it is not to be judged from what evidence or information the police might have or the Chief Minister might have. This is a matter on which the Hon. Chief Minister cannot draw conclusions from certain information that he might get from the police, and on that basis he cannot cast aspersions on the intentions of the hon. Members of this House, for they are all absolutely unfounded and have no basis whatsoever. On the 6th of May when the Members came here they did not at all intend to stage any demonstration. Of course, the Hon. Chief Minister may say, 'I have got my police report. It does not matter what you think. I do not believe you. I believe only my policemen.' But we consider that that order is intended to cast aspersion on the members of the House. Therefore, this question has to be referred to a Committee of Privileges. Why should the Chief Minister be afraid to refer this question to a Committee of Privileges. He can place his own views before that Committee and argue that these things do not constitute a breach of privilege. Why should he be afraid to do so? After all, the Chair has ruled that there is a *prima facie* case for referring this question to the Committee of Privileges."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The motion before the House is whether this question can be referred to a Committee of Privileges. The House has to give its verdict."

9th May 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Yes, Sir. This question has to be decided by the whole House composed of different sections. There is also the section represented by the Hon. Chief Minister. Therefore, I am asking the Hon. Chief Minister and the section represented by him to accept this motion. Why should he be afraid of facing the Committee of Privileges and placing all the facts before that Committee and abiding by the verdict of that Committee ? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Simply because I have expressed the opinion that there seems to be a *prima facie* case, it does not mean that the House will accept the motion.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—“ On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member, Sri Ramamurthi, said that I am afraid of facing the Committee of Privileges. He used the word ‘ afraid ’ many times. He who wants to prevent the casting of aspersions should not himself cast aspersions on others. He should not throw stones at others from his glass house.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Therefore, I submit that a very good case has been made out for referring the whole question to a Committee of Privileges. The House must accept it.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ On a point of information, Sir. You said that the House must decide whether it should be referred to a Committee of Privileges or not. May I just ask for the authority you rely upon ? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Sir Gilbert Campion.”

SRI K. T. RAJU :—“ இப்பொழுது நம் சபையில் என்ன நடக்கிறது என்பது பல மெம்பர்களுக்குத் தெரிய வேண்டியதாக இருப்பதால் இப்பொழுது நடந்த விஷயத்தை தமிழில் சொல்லும்படியாகக் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ அதற்கு நான் என்ன பண்ண முடியும். நடக்கும் விஷயங்கள் எல்லாவற்றையும் மொழிபெயர்க்கவேண்டுமென்பது முடியாத காரியம்.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I have the right of reply ? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have already given enough time to the hon. Member.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I obey you, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ If it comes to the vote, it becomes necessary that all the members of this House should know what is happening here. Therefore, I request you to translate what has happened so far.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am afraid, it is not possible for me to translate it into Tamil, Telugu, Canarese and Malayalam. Please give a whip to your Members. The question is—

‘ That the following question of privilege arising out of :—

(i) the promulgation of an *ex parte* order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code on 6th May 1952 which contained

[Mr. Speaker]

[9th May 1952]

false and insulting allegations against a large section of the Members of the Legislature belonging to the United Democratic Front and the Communist Party, that they have decided to organize demonstrations, etc., and are even likely to do acts of mischief;

(ii) the posting of policemen and police officers and special armed police in large numbers within the Hall, in the corridors behind the last row of seats, and near about the lounge room and bath-room allotted to the Members; and

(iii) the physical obstruction and annoyance caused to quite a good number of Members entering the Government Estate on their way to the Assembly Hall, which has affected the privileges of the Members of the House;

be referred to the Privileges Committee as soon as it is constituted."

The motion was put and declared lost.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I demand a poll."

MR. SPEAKER :—" As the hon. Members know, the Division List is not ready. However, the Chair has got the discretion to take a poll. The Secretary will read out the names of hon. Members in the alphabetical order and those who are for the motion may say ' Aye ' and those who are against may say ' No '."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" At least, this must be translated."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I hope Mr. Nagi Reddi will realize my position."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I submit with all respect to you, Sir, that hon. Members should know the usual practice and procedure. As soon as the division bell is rung, there will be an opportunity for all the Members to sit down calmly. Then the motion will be read out by the Chair in as clear a manner as possible and then the question put. Why should there be so much impatience and trouble about it? "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" There is no impatience. We only want it to be done in our own languages."

11 a.m. MR. SPEAKER :—" I think all the hon. Members are now inside the House. I will proceed with the division."

" The Speaker put the question again and declared it lost. A poll was demanded again and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

Adityan, Sri S. T.
Anjunevalu, Sri G.
Appalaswami, Sri Bojja.
Aranganathan, Sri K.
Arthanari, Sri T. S.
Audanarayana Reddi, Sri Y.
Ayyaru, Sri A.
Balakrishnan, Sri V.
Bapaiah Chowdary, Sri M.
Bapanna Dora, Sri K.
Bapanayya, Sri G.

Chandra Ramalingaiah, Sri.
Chengam Pillay, Sri O.
Chinnama Reddi, Sri P.
Chinnayya, Sri.
Chitrabalam, Dr. G.
Chokkalingam, Sri P.
Dasarathan, Sri D.
Dharmalingam, Sri M.
Dora-wami Gounder, Sri A.
Elaya Pillay, Sri V. T.
Gajapathi Raju, Sri P. V. R.

9th May 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

Ayes—cont.

Gajapathi Reddy, Sri.
 Gopala Gounder, Sri V.
 Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala.
 Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.
 Gopalan, Sri K. P.
 Gopalan Unni, Sri K. C.
 Govinda Rao, Sri K.
 Govindasamy Nayagar, Sri A.
 Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.
 Jangannathan, Sri M.
 Jeevanandam, Sri P.
 Joseph, Sri G.
 Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.
 Kanda ami, Sri C.
 Kandasamy Gounder, Sri P.
 Kandasamy Gounder, Sri S.
 Kanaran, Sri C. H.
 Kasireddy, Sri S.
 Kattumuhu, Sri.
 Kondayya, Sri G. C.
 Koran, Sri O.
 Kotaiah, Sri P.
 Krishnamurthy Gounder, Sri D.
 Krishna Rao, Sri K.
 Krishna Rao, Sri Y. V.
 Kune Rao, Sri M.
 Kunban, Sri E. T.
 Kunhrama Kidav, Sri P.
 Kunhrama Kurup, Sri C.
 Lakshmana Narayana Reddi, Sri.
 Lakshmanaswamy, Sri M.
 Lakshmayya, Sri D.
 Lakshminarasa Raju, Sri B.
 Lakshminpathy Naicker, Sri K. S.
 Madanagopal, Sri V.
 Madhavan Nambiar, Sri K.
 Malakondayya, Sri K.
 Mangala Gounder, Sri M. P.
 Manickasunderam, Sri M.
 Menon, Sri K. B.
 Moidu, Sri K.
 Mookiah Thevar, Sri.
 Mothaya Kudumban, Sri.
 Muthusami, Sri A.
 Nagarajan, Sri V. R.
 Nageshwara Rao, Sri G.
 Nag Reddi, Sri T.
 Nallasivam, Sri K. R.
 Narasa Raju, Sri K. R.
 Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.
 Narayana Kurup, Sri M.
 Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.
 Narayana Nambiar, Sri T. C.
 Narayanasamy, Sri M.
 Packirisami Pillay, Sri S.
 Padmanabha Raju, Sri K. V. S.
 Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri.
 Palanandi, Sri M.
 Palanimuthu, Sri.
 Palanisami, Sri N. K.
 Paramesivanthier, Sri N.
 Paramesivam, Sri N.
 Potharaju, Sri T.
 Prabakara Choudary, Sri C.
 Pulla Reddi, Sri C.
 Radhakrishnan, Sri S.
 Ragheva Mudaliar, Sri E. L.
 Raja, Sri D. K.
 Rajachidambaram, Sri P. B. K.
 Rajagopala Rao, Sri K.
 Raju, Sri K. T.
 Ramabhadra Raju, Sri N.
 Ramachandra Rao, Sri P. S.
 Ramalingam, Sri S.
 Ramamoorthi, Sri P.
 Rama Rao, Sri G.
 Rama Rao, Sri P.
 Rama Rao, Sri V.
 Ramasami, Sri V. V.
 Ramasamy, Sri K. V.
 Ramiah, Sri K.
 Ramiah Choudary, Sri K.
 Ranga Rao, Sri K.
 Rangasami Gounder, Sri R.
 Rathina Gounder, Sri N.
 Rathinam, Sri A.
 Sambantham, Sri K. R.
 Sankaranarayana Menon, Sri V.
 Sankarayya, Sri B.
 Sattyanarayana, Sri G.
 Shanmugam, Sri T.
 Siddanna Gowd, Sri R.
 Sivaraj, Sri N.
 Sivaram Reddi, Sri N.
 Somayajulu, Sri C. V.
 Sridharan, Sri K. T.
 Sri Krishna, Sri V.
 Subba Raju, Sri B.
 Subba Reddi, Sri K.
 Subbarayudu, Sri C.
 Subbiah, Sri A. K.
 Subramaniam, Sri M. P.
 Suryanarayana, Sri G.
 Swayamprakasam, Sri S.
 Syamsundara Rao, Sri P.
 Thangavelu, Sri P.
 Vadivelu, Sri.
 Veerabhadram, Sri M.
 Veloo, Sri A.
 Velukkan, Sri C.
 Vemiah, Sri S.
 Venkaiah, Sri K.
 Venkatakrishna Rao, Sri C.
 Venkata Jagga Rao, Sri R.
 Venkata Kurmi Nayudu, Sri K.
 Venkataram Raju, Sri Aliuri.
 Venkata Ramiah, Sri N.
 Venkatasiviah, Sri P.
 Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri M.
 Venkatesha Shogar, Sri P.
 Venkateswarlu Sri Pillalamarri.
 Venugopala Gounder, Sri M.
 Vinayagam, Sri K.
 Viswanatham, Sri Tenneti.
 Viswanathan, Sri K. R.
 Yellamanda Reddi, Sri G.

Noes.

Adikesavalu Naidu, Sri K.
 Anandan, Sri L.
 Anantha Pai, Sri T.
 Anthony Peter, Sri.
 Appala Naidu, Sri K.

Appa Rao Bahadur, Sri Raja Meka
 Rangayya.
 Appu, Sri A.
 Ardhanareswara Gounder, Sri.
 Arumugam, Sri R. S.
 Arumugam, Sri S.

[Mr. Speaker]

[9th May 1952]

Noes—cont.

- Arumugam, Sri S. R.
 Arunachala Mudaliar, Sri A. J.
 Ato annaidu, Sri T. C.
 Balanarayana Reddi, Sri K.
 Balarama Reddi, Sri A.
 Bapu Naidu, Sri P.
 Bomman, Sri K. H.
 Chellapund an, Sri S.
 Chellathurai, Sri P.
 Chenchurama Naidu, Sri N.
 Chinnakaruppa Thevar, Sri S.
 Ch nnasami Na du, Sri C.
 Ch nnathambi Thevar, Sri.
 Ch kkalingam Chettiar, Sri AR. A. RM.
 Darmalinga Nayakar, Sri V.
 Dasaratharamaiah Naidu, Sri D.
 Doraiakannu, Sri M.
 Durugaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Sri V.
 Elumalai Sri T. P.
 Fernandez, Sri W. J.
 Gangappa, Sri M.
 Gangayya Naidu, Sri B.
 Gopalakrishna Reddi, Sri P.
 Gopala Menon, Sri N.
 Govindan, Sri G.
 Gunnayya, Sri P.
 Ishwara, Sri K.
 Kaliannan, Sri T. M.
 Kandasami Padayachi, Sri M.
 Kannan, Sri V. K.
 Karuthiruman, Sri P. G.
 Kempai Gounder, Sri.
 Khad r Sheriff, Janab S.
 Kosalam, Sri K. T.
 Koti Reddi, Sri K.
 Kotamma Reddi, Srimathi Thamma.
 Krishnamurthy Rao, Sri B.
 Krishna Rao, The Hon. Dr. U.
 Krishnasamy Ayyangar, Sri P. S.
 Krishnasamy Padayachi, Sri V.
 Krishnaswami Naidu, Sri R.
 Kuppaswami, Sri R.
 Kuttikrishna Nayar, The Hon. Sri K. P.
 Lakshmana Das, Sri L.
 Lakshmana Kandar, Sri C.
 Lakshmi Narasimham Dora, Sri R.
 Latchanna, Sri G.
 Mahalingam, Sri N.
 Mallayya, Sri T.
 Manickavelu Naicker, The Hon. Sri M. A.
 Manickam, Sri P. G.
 Manjaya Shetty, Sri.
 Marimuthu, Sri M.
 Masilamani Chettiar, Sri A. K.
 Muhamed Salih Maraikayar, Janab.
 Mounsguruswamy Naidu, Sri N.
 Muni Reddi, Sri M.
 Munisami Pillay, Sri M. S.
 Munuswamy Gownder, Sri P. M.
 Murthy Raju, Sri Ch. S. R. V. P.
 Muthah Chettiar, Raja Sri M. A.
 Muthiah Pillai, Sri C.
 Muthu, Sri V.
 Muthukumaraswamy, Sri.
 Muthukumaraswamy Naidu, Sri T. D.
 Muthu Thevar, Sri B. R. M.
 Nag abhushanam, Sri G.
 Nagana Goud, The Hon. Dr. R.
 Nalla Gounder, Sri P. S.
 Nallaswamy, Sri B. K.
 Nanjappa, Sri O. A.
 Narayana, Sri Kavalli.
 Na ayanappa, Sri S.
 Narayana Raju, Sri D.
 Naravanasamy Na du, Sri G.
 Neeladri Rao Reddi, Sri Asi
 Pais, Sri L. C.
 Palaniappan, Sri R. M.
 Palanisami Gounder, The Hon. Sri V. C.
 Palanisami Gounder, Sri V. K.
 Panchaksharam, Sri S.
 Pandian, Sri R. S. K.
 Parameswaran, Sri B.
 Paramesw-rappa, Sri S.
 Pattabhiramara, The Hon Sri S. B. P.
 Pentannaidu, Sri M.
 Periasami, Sri M. P.
 Pundarikakshacharyulu, Sri V. P.
 Rajagopal, Sri N.
 Rajam Ramaswami, Sri C.
 Rajaram, Sri K.
 Rama, Sri T. K.
 Ramab'abham, Sri D.
 Ramachandra Reddiar, Sri A.
 Ramakrishna Ayyar, Sri N.
 Ramalinga Reddi, Sri H.
 Ramasamy Kander, Sri N. C.
 Ramasamy Mudaliar, Sri V. K.
 Ramasamy Naidu, Sri S.
 Ramasamy Thevar, Sri A.
 Rami Reddi, Sri A.
 Ranga Reddi, Sri P.
 Rangasamy Naidu, Sri P. S.
 Ratnasami, Sri A. M.
 Sahajanauda, Sri A. S.
 Sambandam, Sri A. M.
 Sambasivam, Sri A.
 Simia Koorayar, Sri G.
 Sangam Naidu, Sri P.
 Sanjeeviah, The Hon. Sri D.
 Sankara Reddi, The Hon. Sri N.
 Sankara Varma Raja, Sri E. K.
 Sannasi, Sri T. V.
 Santhappa, Sri K.
 Satyanarayana Dora, Sri H.
 Satyanarayana Reddi, Sri P.
 Selvaraj, Sri P.
 Shankar, Sri M. G.
 Shanmuga Rajeswara Sethupathi, he
 Hon. Raja Sri Raja of Ramanathapuram.)
 Sha muzham, Sri K.
 Shetty, The Hon. Sri A. B.
 S rasappa, Sri Ijari.
 Sivaprakasam, Sri V. S.
 Somasun ara Gounder, Sri.
 Somayajulu Sri S.
 Sou'aram Ramachandran, Dr. T. S.
 Srungaram, Sri.
 Subbaraj, Sri A. S.
 Subba Reddi, Sri M.
 Subbaraya Gounder, Sri A. K.
 Subramanian, The Hon. Sri C.
 Subramaniam Gounder, Sri K. S.
 Subramania Pillay, Sri I. K.
 Subramania Nayakar, Sri M.
 Suryanarayana, Sri K.
 Suryanarayana Raju, Sri Raja Sagi.
 Suvarna, Sri N. N.
 Swaminathan, Sri R. V.

9th May 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

Noes—cont.

Thangavelu, Sri R.
 Thagaraja Pillay, Sri.
 Thimma Reddi, Sri P.
 Thinekarasami Thevar, Sri.
 Thirumurthi, Sri P. K.
 Urkavalan, Sri P.
 Vaheesam Pillay, Sri G.
 Vaikunta Rajga, Sri B.
 Vaikuntam, Sri.
 Varadan, Sri T. R.
 Varadarajulu Naidu, Dr. P.
 Veeranna Padali, Sri K.
 Vema Reddy, Sri K. V.
 Venkata Setty, Sri K.

Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri O.
 Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri T. N.
 Venkatasubbayya, Sri P.
 Venkatayya, Sri N.
 Venkatarayana Dora, Sri K.
 Venkatrama Ayyar, Sri S.
 Venkatramalaiah, Sri A.
 Venkatramana Gowda, Sri K.
 Venkatswami Reddi, Sri P.
 Venkatswamy Naidu, The Hon. Sri K.
 Venugopalakrishnasamy, Sri.
 Victoria, Mr. J. L. P. Roche.
 Virupakshayya, Sri.

Neutral.

Ahamed Kutty, Janab C.
 Chadayan, Sri M.
 Chidambaram, Sri V.

Kunhi Muhamed Shafee, Janab.
 Ramakrishnan, Sri K.
 Uppi, Janab K.

Ayes—148; Noes—175; Neutral—6."

The motion was lost.

II.—DISCUSSION ON HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—cont.

MR. SPEAKER :—" As the question hour is now over we will proceed to the next item. The short notice question will be taken up on the next working day. We shall proceed with the debate on the Governor's Address."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have moved an amendment regarding the unemployment position in the handloom industry in this State. There are about ten lakhs of handloom workers in this State of whom about one lakh are in my district of Malabar. I can say that out of this about 75 to 90 per cent are now unemployed and wherever we turn, whether it be the bus-stand or any other place, we find the unemployed handloom workers going about begging. I want to remind the hon. Members of this House how the Congress in the past fought against the British Government's policies directed towards ruining our national industries and how Congress volunteers like Kumaran of Tiruppur and Babukannu of Bombay and a host of others gave up their lives in the campaign for the boycott of foreign cloth so that our national industries may survive and foreign cloth may be wiped off from our markets. But what has happened?

" Five years of rule by the Congress has resulted in the ruination of the handloom industry in this State. Nobody can deny that fact. In our district of Malabar, in Cannanore and Chirakkal taluks, there are about 20,000 weavers. Only a few of them are working at present, and the rest of them are really starving. They have got no money to purchase even their rations. Unless the Government come to their immediate relief, there will be starvation deaths. In the Address of His Excellency the Governor, it has been stated that the Government are giving thought to this subject and that they will soon announce the measures which they propose to take. This reminds me of the following story. Once a patient who was seriously ill and about to die sent his son to

12
noon.